

State of Utah DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA Division Director 4

October 21, 2008

Shawn Baker, Resident Agent Co-Op Mining Company P.O. Box 1240 Huntington, Utah 84528

Subject: Rejection of Bath House Parking Lot Expansion, Task ID #3066, Co-Op Mining

Company, Bear Canyon Mine, C/015/0025

Dear Mr. Baker:

The Division received your application for the above-noted permit change on October 6, 2008. Pursuant to R645-303-221, the Division completed the requisite 15-day Initial Completeness Review (ICR) and denies this application for a technical review.

The deficiency letter that was sent to the operator during the previous review (dated September 23rd, 2008), explicitly requested that the entire application be resubmitted. It was not.

In addition, the hard copy that was submitted to the Division does not match the CD version that was sent. This is problematic for several reasons. The hard copy that goes into the Public Information Center (PIC) in Salt Lake City is the version that we at the Division put forth to the public as to what was officially submitted by an operator. In this instance, the paper copy was missing numerous plates that were marked for replacement by the submitted C2 form. The maps were on the digital version, but not in the paper copy. In addition, the C2 form calls for the replacement of pages 8A-1, 8A-43, 8A-53, 8A-58 and 8A-59. These pages were not submitted. If they were submitted, they were not clearly noted.

The two forms of the amendment (i.e. electronic and paper copy) <u>must</u> match. Prior to submitting an amendment, please have someone go page by page and insure that the electronic and hard copies are exactly the same. As part of the initial review process, Division staff performs this task and in the future, if they do not match, the amendment does not pass initial review.



Furthermore, the paper and CD versions must match because the electronic amendments are sent to other regulatory agencies. If the official copy in the Division's PIC room does not match what is being sent to other regulatory agencies, then the door is open for confusion.

We fully recognize that this may seem bureaucratic and tedious and that's because it is. However, as a government agency, the Division must provide an accurate representation to the public as to what was submitted as we go through the iterative review process. As part of the Division's charge of providing the information to the public, each and every piece of paper that's submitted must be processed (i.e. scanned, filed and routed). If the amendment is incomplete or requires additional information to be submitted, the processing of that information must be done again. Doing so greatly reduces the Division's efficiency in processing and ultimately reviewing amendments.

In the future, please be more diligent in insuring that the C2 forms, as well as the digital and electronic copies that are submitted to the Division, are complete and consistent with one another. In addition, the submittal must clearly identify the pages to be replaced, modified, deleted etc. The Division does not have the staff and resources available to absorb these types of avoidable oversights.

If you have any questions, please call me (801) 538-5262 for further details.

Sincerely,

James D. Smith Permit Supervisor

sqs

O:\015025.BCN\DRAFT\WG3066\IRrejection_10_21.doc